

1 proceeding. In summary, Appellant takes exception to the Director's determination that she does
2 not provide support to the co-directors of the unit and that the scope and level of her duties do not
3 meet those envisioned by the Administrative Assistant A classification.

4
5 Appellant works for the Shared Client Services (SCS) area of the Center for Information Services.
6 The human resource function for the organization is administered by Bellevue Community College.
7 Appellant's duties include preparing and coordinating interagency agreements and statements of
8 work for project contracts; recruiting employees for contracts and projects; and performing general
9 support functions for the office. Appellant takes work direction and provides information directly
10 to the co-directors, but as evidenced by the PQ Appellant completed and signed, she reports directly
11 to the office manager. (See pages 1 and 7 of Ex. 1).

12
13 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant disputes the reporting relationship she included in
14 her PQ and asserts that she actually reports to the co-directors. Appellant argues that she is
15 responsible for recruiting personnel; drafting exempt contract work statements; completing the
16 appropriate hiring documents; providing orientation for new employees; processing timesheets,
17 billings and invoices; and forwarding payroll and leave information to Bellevue Community
18 College. In addition, Appellant argues that she has delegated purchasing authority up to \$500 and
19 that she participates in planning, expenditures and analysis of purchases. Appellant asserts that she
20 performs duties and responsibilities in many areas, that her job is complex, and that she supervises
21 hourly student employees. Appellant contends that her position is best described by the
22 Administrative Assistant A classification.

23
24 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues Appellant's position is best described
25 by the Office Assistant III classification. Respondent acknowledges that Appellant performs a
26 variety of work under general supervision and that the level of detail involved in her work is

1 complex in nature. However, Respondent contends that Appellant's duties such as processing
2 documents, searching for candidates, placing ads, monitoring expenditures, maintaining monthly
3 reports, and processing billing documents, are encompassed by the Office Assistant III
4 classification.

5
6 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly
7 allocated to the Office Assistant III classification should be affirmed.

8
9 **Relevant Classifications.** Office Assistant III, class code 2222, and Administrative Assistant A,
10 class code 2045.

11
12 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
13 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
14 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
15 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
16 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
17 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
18 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
19 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

20
21 In relevant part, the basic function and distinguishing characteristics for the Administrative
22 Assistant A classification encompass positions that provide support in a variety of functional areas
23 directly to the chief administrator or head of a major organizational unit or administrative
24 department and that perform or coordinate administrative support functions for the entire unit,
25 develop and establish procedures and apply policies for the unit. The duties Appellant describes in
26 her PQ do not include developing or establishing procedures or applying policies. Rather, in

1 conjunction with her supervisor and various project associates, Appellant provides support
2 functions for her unit. The nature of the duties and responsibilities assigned to Appellant are best
3 described as complex clerical functions.

4
5 The basic function and distinguishing characteristics for the Office Assistant III classification
6 encompass positions that independently perform a variety of complex clerical assignments and
7 projects and that resolve problems and respond to inquires. Examples of clerical assignments are
8 preparing reports; establishing and maintaining record keeping systems or data base files;
9 monitoring financial records; responding to inquiries regarding policies and procedures; composing
10 correspondence; assisting in the preparation, compilation and coordination of reports and records;
11 compiling and keyboarding material such as financial, technical, and statistical reports; performing
12 complex word processing tasks; computing salaries, costs and fees; performing electronic mail
13 tasks; and ordering, receiving and maintaining inventory. The duties described in Appellant's PQ
14 fall within this description of complex clerical duties. Appellant prepares documents, reports and
15 correspondence; monitors expenditures and the status of monthly projects; estimates costs,
16 researches information; shares information with other staff and the co-directors; and advises new
17 staff on existing policies and procedures. These duties and responsibilities are encompassed by the
18 Office Assistant III classification.

19
20 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
21 determination dated January 20, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director’s determination dated January 20, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

Leana D. Lamb, Member